

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/649,426	08/26/2003	Thomas S. Roche	SC12515ZP	5203	
23125	7590 11/24/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FREESCALE SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.			NGUYEN, THANH T		
LAW DEPAR 7700 WEST R	የTMENT PARMER LANE MD:Tን	(32/PL02	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
AUSTIN, TX	78729		2813		

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			·······································
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	:
	10/649,426	ROCHE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	<u>:</u>
	Thanh T. Nguyen	2813	
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence add	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of th will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this com ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	rnunication.
Status			÷
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.		:
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	•	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under l	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	:
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-20</u> is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 8-13</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 14</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			:
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyation is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in prity documents have bee nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National S	tage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/03.	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO- 	152)

Application/Control Number: 10/649,426

Art Unit: 2813

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a)-(d).

# Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 8/26/03 has been considered.

#### Oath/Declaration

Oath/Declaration filed on 8/26/03 has been considered.

# Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/649,426

Art Unit: 2813

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,323).

Referring to figures 11a-11e, Sakata et al. teaches a method of forming a bond pad comprising the steps of:

Providing semiconductor substrate (31);

Forming a bond pad layer (32) over the semiconductor substrate (31);

Forming a protection layer (34) over the bond pad layer; and

Removing a portion of the protection layer using an etch chemistry comprising hydrogen peroxide and an amine (see col. 12, lines 65-67).

Regarding to claims 2, the amine is ammonium hydroxide (see col. 12, lines 65-67).

Regarding to claim 3, the etch chemistry consists of hydrogen peroxide and ammonium hydroxide (see col. 12, lines 65-67).

Regarding to claims 5, 11-12, forming a protection layer (TiN) further comprises forming a protection layer comprising titanium and nitrogen (TiN, see col. 12, lines 38-40).

Regarding to claims 6, 13, forming a bond pad layer (32) comprising aluminum (Al, see col. 12, lines 29-30).

Regarding to claim 8, removing a portion of the protection layer (34) using an etch chemistry comprising of hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen (see col. 12, lines 65-67).

Art Unit: 2813

Regarding to claim 9, etch chemistry comprises hydrogen peroxide and an amine (see col. 12, lines 65-67).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,323).

Sakata et al. teaches a method of forming a bond pad and removing the protection layer using an etch chemistry of hydrogen peroxide and ammonium hydroxide. However, Sakata et al. does not teach the specific etching ratio of the etchants.

The etching chemistry ratio of the etchants are considered to involve routine optimization while has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in In re Aller, the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

"Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art...such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the

general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."

In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any etching chemistry ratio of the etchants range suitable to the method in process of Sakata et al. in order to optimize the process.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-20 are allowed over the prior art.

Claims 7, 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the Prior Art alone or in combination teaches a subset of forming a polyimide layer over the protection layer, and patterning the polyimide layer to form an opening; and wherein removing the portion of the protective layer is performed after patterning the polyimide layer and the removing is selective to the bond pad layer and the polyimide layer.

Art Unit: 2813

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1695, or by Email via address Thanh Nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956 (See MPEP 203.08).

Thanh Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Patent Examining Group 2800

TTN